

Serial No. 10/712,034  
August 18, 2005  
Reply to the Office Action dated May 13, 2005  
Page 5 of 7

#### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 13, 14, 17, 18, 22 and 23 are pending in this application. By this amendment, Applicants cancel claims 9-12, 15, 16 and 19-21, amend claims 13 and 14, and add new claims 22 and 23.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 13, 14 and 17-19 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 9-12, 15, 16, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki et al. (U.S. 4,772,823).

Applicants have amended allowable claim 13 to be in independent form including all of the features of claims 11 and 12, and have amended allowable claim 14 to be in independent form including all of the features of base claim 11. In addition, Applicants have canceled claims 9-12, 15, 16 and 19-21. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 9-12, 15, 16, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki et al. is moot.

New claim 22 recites:

“An electronic component comprising:  
two cap-shaped terminal members including iron or an iron-containing alloy;  
a central conductor including copper or a copper-containing alloy;  
and  
an element having a through hole for receiving the central conductor; wherein  
inner surfaces of the cap-shaped terminal members are opposed to respective end surfaces of the central conductor and joined thereto by resistance welding;  
a first alloy layer containing nickel, copper and iron is formed at the cap-shaped terminal side of an interface between each of the cap-shaped terminals and the central conductor;  
a second alloy layer containing nickel and copper is formed at the central conductor side of said interface;  
a nickel film is formed on each of the surfaces of the cap-shaped terminal member excluding portions on which the first alloy layers are formed; and

Serial No. 10/712,034  
August 18, 2005  
Reply to the Office Action dated May 13, 2005  
Page 6 of 7

**a silver film is formed on each of the nickel films.” (emphasis added)**

Matsuzaki et al. merely teaches that a pole piece 2 is welded to an anode cylinder 12, and at one portion of the joint between the pole piece 2 and the anode cylinder 12, a copper-nickel welded alloy 26 is formed, and at another portion of the joint between the pole piece 2 and the anode cylinder 12, a copper-nickel-iron alloy is formed. Matsuzaki et al. neither teaches nor suggests the features of “a first alloy layer containing nickel, copper and iron is formed at the cap-shaped terminal side of an interface between each of the cap-shaped terminals and the central conductor” and “a second alloy layer containing nickel and copper is formed at the central conductor side of said interface” as recited in Applicants’ claim 22.

In addition, the only silver that is disclosed in Matsuzaki et al. is a brazing material which includes silver and copper. Matsuzaki et al. fails to teach or suggest any silver film, and certainly fails to teach or suggest the features of “a nickel film is formed on each of the surfaces of the cap-shaped terminal member excluding portions on which the first alloy layers are formed” and “a silver film is formed on each of the nickel films” as recited in Applicants’ claim 22.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Matsuzaki et al. fails to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in Applicants’ claim 22.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 13, 14 and 22 are allowable. Claims 17, 18 and 23 depend upon claims 13, 14 and 22, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claims 13, 14 and 22 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

Serial No. 10/712,034  
August 18, 2005  
Reply to the Office Action dated May 13, 2005  
Page 7 of 7

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition the Commissioner for a ONE-month extension of time, extending to September 13, 2005, the period for response to the Office Action dated May 13, 2005.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 18, 2005

  
Attorneys for Applicant

Joseph R. Keating  
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett  
Registration No. 46,710

**KEATING & BENNETT LLP**  
10400 Eaton Place, Suite 312  
Fairfax, VA 22030  
Telephone: (703) 385-5200  
Facsimile: (703) 385-5080